



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

necessity of later tyrannies arose. No foreigner at least will believe that such measures were needed to keep so great a multitude of Frenchmen as were swept into the drag-net of the Law of Suspects from betraying their country to the allies who were anxious to operate another partition of Poland with France as the spoil. Moreover, the "Terrorists" in a not unnatural way identified themselves with France, and their political enemies became traitors to France.

Although the greatest merit of this work lies in its bringing together an astonishing amount of information from trustworthy sources and describing the hitherto little known and imperfectly understood workings of the republican régime, it also contains descriptions of singular interest, appreciations of historic personages, of Danton, of Mme. Roland, of Robespierre—portraits drawn with a firm and skilful hand, which interpret their mental and moral evolution. In the course of the volume Professor Aulard destroys various old and honored legends—that for example which pictures Thermidorianism as in any sense a reaction against the republic, another that exonerates the so-called "working members" of the Committee of Public Safety and particularly Carnot from responsibility for the wholesale proscriptions of the Terror, and still another that makes republicanism an early development of the Revolutionary movement. Americans will be pleased to find the measure of the influence exerted by the young republics of the Confederation, later by the new United States, more exactly explained, with adequate documentary references, than in any previous work.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

*Boundaries of the United States and of the Several States and Territories.* By HENRY GANNETT. Second edition. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1900. Pp. 142.)

IN 1885 Mr. Gannett issued, as one of the early bulletins of the United States Geological Survey, a sketch of the *Boundaries of the United States and of the Several States and Territories*. The compilation, though inaccurate in some details, was nevertheless a useful one. There was apparently considerable demand for it, since it has been for some time out of print. More recently Mr. Gannett has issued a second edition as number 171 of the same series of bulletins. The principal feature of the reissue is the addition of historical diagrams, representing the successive stages through which the several states and territories have passed. Mr. Gannett first printed these diagrams in 1896 to illustrate an article in the *Journal of the American Geographical Society* entitled "A Graphic History of the United States." They contain a number of errors, most of which have been repeated in a series of maps, illustrating a monograph on "The Territorial Expansion of the United States," published in the *Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance* for September last and also issued separately. As these errors are likely still further to mislead, in view both of the high authority popularly attached to government publications and of the fact that they usually escape formal criticism, it seems worth while to call attention to them.

The Indiana diagram erroneously represents a broad strip of land running the entire length of the eastern boundary of the present state, as added to the territory in 1803. No such parcel ever existed. The first division of the Northwest territory, as a result of which Indiana territory was formed, was made by a line, which followed the Greenville line from the mouth of the Kentucky River to Fort Recovery, and from that point extended due north to the international boundary. The addition to Indiana territory made under the Ohio act, which was passed in 1802 instead of 1803, was a triangle, formed by the intersection of the western boundary of Ohio with the Greenville line, and resting upon the Ohio River as its base. This triangle may be easily traced upon any land office map, by noticing that the Congressional townships in this tract do not match those in the remainder of the state.

Mr. Gannett has mistaken the extent of the original territory of Michigan. Its western boundary was a line drawn through the middle of Lake Michigan from its southern to its northern extremity and thence north to the international boundary. Michigan territory in its original form thus consisted of the lower peninsula and a small tract north of the Lakes and east of the meridian of the Straits of Mackinac. This latter tract is usually, if not invariably, omitted in the contemporary maps. Mr. Gannett has erroneously extended the northern peninsula westward to the meridian of the present western boundary of the state of Indiana. By so doing, he has given Michigan territory a form which it never assumed and has included in it a tract which, after the organization of Illinois territory in 1809, should have been represented as a detached part of the territory of Indiana.

The contemporary maps of Kansas territory follow the provisions of the Kansas Territorial Act in running the southern boundary west on the the 37th parallel as far as the territory of New Mexico and thence north and west on that boundary to the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Gannett has followed some recent maps in carrying the southern boundary west on the parallel only as far as the rooth meridian, thence north to the Arkansas River and west on that river to its source. This line is based upon an erroneous impression that the tract south of the Arkansas was excluded from Kansas territory by reason of the non-extinction of the Indian title. The Territorial Act provided: "That nothing in this act contained shall be construed . . . to include any territory, which, by treaty with any Indian tribe, is not, without the consent of said tribe, to be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any state or territory." There were guarantees against such inclusion in some treaties creating reservations for emigrant tribes, but there were no such guarantees in any treaties with the native tribes occupying western Kansas. Moreover, except in the unratified treaty of Fort Laramie, the Arkansas River had not been recognized as an Indian boundary and, even if it had been, there is as much reason for excluding from Kansas territory the country of the Arapahos and Cheyennes north of the river as for excluding that claimed by the Comanches and Kiowas south of it, since the

title of neither had been extinguished. It follows, therefore, that Mr. Gannett's representation of Kansas territory is incorrect and that the tract marked as an addition to the state in 1861 was not an addition but a part of the original territory.

Mr. Gannett's most serious difficulties occur in connection with Dakota and the adjoining territories. Here his errors of omission in the text become errors of commission in the diagrams. He has overlooked the last section of the first Dakota Act, by which Nebraska territory was extended westward to the 110th meridian and has thus omitted one of the forms which that territory assumed. He has also overlooked the last section of the Montana Act, by which a tract of land, roughly corresponding to the present state of Wyoming, was transferred from Idaho to Dakota, and has thus omitted to represent the former territory in its second and the latter in its third stage of development. By this transfer Dakota territory acquired, except for a slight change in the Nebraska boundary, the area of the present states of North and South Dakota and Wyoming, lacking a strip on the west bounded by the 110th and 111th meridians, the 41st parallel and the crest of the Rocky Mountains, while Idaho territory was reduced to the limits of the present state plus as much of the strip just defined as lay between the 42d parallel and the mountains.

By overlooking this transfer to Dakota territory, Mr. Gannett has also missed the point of an interesting complication that arose in the adjustment of the boundary between the territories of Idaho and Montana. The maps of this period represent the Rocky Mountains as cutting the 111th meridian below the parallel of  $44^{\circ} 30'$  and as crossing this parallel at some distance west of the meridian, thus enclosing a tongue of land between the mountains, the parallel on the north and the meridian on the east, which by the terms of the transfer and upon contemporary maps formed a part of Dakota territory. The mountains in their true location cut the meridian at or a little above this parallel and so do not form the supposed tract. It follows that the definition of the boundary of the transfer from Idaho territory to Dakota territory, contained in the Montana Act, is impossible of application at this point and that the supposed tract, not having any existence, disappears from the modern map representing the boundaries of this period. When Wyoming territory was created in 1868, with the 111th meridian as its western boundary, this supposed tract, west of the meridian, was forgotten, but afterwards, in 1873, Congress passed a special act attaching "that portion of Dakota territory, west of the 111th meridian, which remains detached and distant from Dakota proper some two hundred miles" to the adjoining territory of Montana. As no such tract existed, this act could have no effect. Mr. Gannett says that the tract did not exist but fails to see why it did not exist and why it was supposed to exist.

Two other mistakes may be mentioned in closing. In representing the second stage of the territory of Arkansas, Mr. Gannett has drawn the western boundary much too far toward the west. It should begin but

forty miles west of the southwest corner of Missouri. Mr. Gannett represents Iowa as admitted in 1845, with the meridian of  $17^{\circ} 30'$  west from Washington as its western and a parallel passing through the mouth of the Mankato River as its northern boundary. The act of 1845 was conditioned upon its acceptance by the people of the territory and, as this was refused, it never took effect. The state was not admitted until 1846, when it entered the Union with its present boundaries. Attention has been chiefly directed to the diagrams, since they appeal to the eye and on that account are likely to make the stronger impression. Except for the errors noted, the text is in the main accurate.

FRANK HEYWOOD HODDER.

*The True Thomas Jefferson.* By WILLIAM ELLEROY CURTIS.  
(Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1901. Pp. 395.)

THE present volume, being the fourth in the Lippincott series of the "true" lives of famous Americans, is the most ambitious yet published, exceeding by almost one-third the bulk of any of the earlier volumes. Were Mr. Curtis not already well known, it would be easy to conclude from a very cursory examination of his book that he is not a literary man, for his work partakes far more of the scrap-book quality than of the biography, being put together, rather than written, without the slightest apparent sequence, the result bearing a closer resemblance to a crazy-work quilt than to any piece of intentional weaving. Equally evident is it that the author has no general knowledge of history to qualify him for such work, for the book teems with errors and misstatements, some of them being of the most extraordinary nature. What can be said, for instance, of assertions such as that "William and Mary is the oldest college in America, although Harvard graduated the first class" (p. 65), when the veriest tyro should know that Harvard had fifty years start of its southern prototype; that Jefferson was "not in favour of emancipation unless the slaves could be *extirpated*" (p. 83), which is Mr. Curtis's version of Jefferson's wish to see the negroes freed and *colonized*; that Jefferson's slaves concealed "their master's plate when the British visited Monticello in 1814" (p. 95); that "Governor Fauquier introduced French novels, classical music, card playing, and many new vices into the colony" (p. 69); that the election of Adams to the presidency was due directly to the influence of Washington (pp. 273-275); or that the classical names invented by Jefferson, in the ordinance of 1784, for the northwestern states were "for the states to be carved out of the Louisiana territory" (p. 184)? Such perversions are bad enough, but Mr. Curtis again and again, with apparent deliberation, exactly reverses records so clear that it seems impossible he can have read the very documents from which he quotes. Thus, in the case of the criminal law of Virginia in the revision of 1779, the only means by which we have knowledge of Jefferson's share is an apology he drew up concerning the principle of *lex talionis* which it embodied, yet from this apology Mr. Curtis is led to state that the principle of the *lex talionis* was abandoned